FUNNYWORLD 7

FUNNYWORLD, No. 7, September 1967. Published irregularly by Mike Barrier, 5112 P Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72207. Copyright (C) 1967 by J. Michael Barrier.

THE FRONT COVER is by John Fawcett, who teaches art at the University of Connecticut. It's one of a delightful series of "cubist comic characters" that John has done. John is that rarity of rarities, a "pop" artist who loves what he paints. Hopefully, some more of his drawings will appear in FW from time to time. (John also makes a proposal on this issue's letters page; I'll withold comment on it until I've heard what other readers say.) If anyone else feels the urge to contribute any ink drawings to FUNNYWORLD, they would be more than welcome. There'll definitely be some interior art next issue, even if I have to do it myself.

As most of you doubtless already know, from reading the October UNCLE SCROOGE, the supply of new Carl Barks stories has at last run dry. The supply of Barks-illustrated stories, that is. Barks wrote the script for "King Scrooge the First" in June 1966, shortly before his retirement. It was written as a 24-page story and later cut to 21 pages by Western Printing's editors. That accounts for any bumps in the continuity. The art is by (I think) Tony Strobl. It's at least better than much of the art in other recent Disney comics. There's one more Barks-written story yet to come; it'll have the ducks in the North Woods, facing a "loup garou." And Barks is still doing covers for the Disney comics, on the average of one a month. But that's all. There was a possibility that Barks might write some more stories in retirement, and possibly even illustrate a few more early this year, but that never came to pass.

Late last spring, Don Draganski sent me a clipping from a Chicago paper that reproduced some of the illustrations Walt Disney did for his high school magazine. The accompanying text said the Disney Studio had sought out the old cartoons "to include in a book of Disney's works." This intrigued me, and I wrote the Studio to ask for more information. I received this reply:

> At present plans are being made for a group of books to be published as a tribute to Walt and a permanent record of his achievements. There will be an official biography, to be followed by separate volumes on Comic Art, Music, Nature, Education and so on. It is too early to tell when the books will appear, probably a year or two from now.

Perhaps even better news is that an unofficial biography of Walt Disney is due early next year: THE DISNEY VERSION, by Richard Schickel. Schickel is LIFE magazine's regular movie reviewer, and also is the author of a history of the movies, published two or three years ago.

Dick Martin, the Oz illustrator and leading light of the International Wizard of Oz Club, is searching for an early Disney book: MICKEY MOUSE MOVIE STORIES #2, published by McKay around 1934. This is a thick, oblong book, bound in green cloth. It's somewhat similar to the first MOVIE STORIES book, published in 1931. Should you have a copy available for sale or trade--or know where one might be found--write Dick at 529 Wrightwood Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60614.

ANIMATED CARTOONS: NEWS & NOTES

IF ALL GOES WELL, a one-hour animated musical special called "Equal Time for Pogo" will be shown on television in the fall of '68. It will be an MGM cartoon, produced by Chuck Jones. Kelly was at MGM this summer; the screenplay will be his, and will include some songs from "Songs of Pogo," that Kelly LP of a few years back. If a package deal goes through, there will be more Pogo specials...MGM plans a second Dr. Seuss special, also for '68, this one "Horton Hears a Who."...MGM began production of "The Phantom Tollbooth," its first feature cartoon, on April 3...Abe Levitow is the director of the half-hour animation sequences that are to lead off the new MGM TV show, "Off to See the Wizard," each week. The live-action portions of the programs will be old movies, unsold TV pilots, David Wolper documentaries, etc.--all in an effort to cash in on the popularity of the Disney program's format.

> YOU'LL RECALL that there was a gopher in the first of the Disney "Winnie the Pooh" featurettes, "Winnie the Pooh and the Honey Tree." At one point, the gopher cracked that "wasn't in the book." Disney was criticized loudly in England for making free with yet another British classic. But, in fact, the gopher is a Milne character--he appears in some unpublished Milne stories. One of Milne's relatives verified this in a letter to a London newspaper.

WALT DISNEY PRODUCTIONS laid off half its animation department--including all the breakdown animators and "inbetweeners"--at the end of April. However, this doesn't mean that the Disney animation program has been curtailed as a result of Walt's death. The cause instead was a decision to complete all the storyboards for "The Aristocats" before beginning production. Under Walt, production would begin before the storyboards for a feature cartoon were complete, which frequently resulted in a lot of finished animation being junked. (For example, Walt threw out most of what was to have been a "Winnie the Pooh" feature because he was dissatisfied with it; enough was salvaged for the featurette released last spring, and more may be used in the second "Winnie" featurette. Enough finished animation from the forthcoming "Jungle Book" was discarded to fill a trash barrel.) This situation was aggravated in Walt's later years, when his other projects prevented him from devoting much time to the cartoon program. Now, production will not begin until the storyboards for a cartoon have been completed and given final approval. This change in policy makes a lot of sense, obviously, but halting animation of a feature means halting a lot of animation; hence the layoffs. The preliminary storyboards for "The Aristocats" were completed this summer and approved by the Disney executives; work is now under way on the final storyboards, with production--and rehiring--expected to begin early next year. In the meantime, the remaining animation crew is working on other projects, among them the second "Winnie" featurette, now scheduled for completion in February 1968. This featurette, "Winnie

(Continued on Page 30.)

QUACK TALK

COMMENT ON LAST ISSUE'S "THE LORD OF QUACKLY HALL"

I didn't get as many letters on "The Lord of Quackly Hall" as I had hoped, but many of those I did get were dandies. For some reason, there wasn't much overlap in the comments. Most people said they liked the article, but what one person discussed at length another person barely mentioned or passed over completely. I suppose you could conclude from this that the article was either weak throughout or strong throughout. For obvious reasons, I prefer the latter interpretation.

I've made a lot of changes in the article for its appearance in COMIC ART, and I've been tempted to make other changes. I've rearranged the article slightly, shifting some paragraphs to the rear, and I've rewritten several sections so that it's easier to tell what I had in mind when I said what I said. The last half of the article suffered from the haste in which it was written, and so the changes are concentrated there. The sections on Barks-as-parodist and Barks-as-illustrator were particularly muddy. Here, as in other places, I wound up shortchanging Barks without meaning to.

Bill Spicer and Richard Kyle deserve my special thanks, since their comments prompted me to make the most changes. Richard's comments on the organization of the article were especially helpful (I haven't reprinted them here, since they make pretty dull reading to anyone who isn't the author of the article). Obviously, though, what use I've made of their suggestions is my own. Blame me if you don't like the changes in the article; praise Bill and Richard if you do.

I've also tried to make it clear the article is about Barks' stories, and not about what was going on inside his head at the time he wrote and illustrated them. This was what I meant to do all along, but I slipped into ambiguity and possibly even misrepresentation on too many occasions. Carl Barks knows better than anyone else <u>why</u> he did what he did; perhaps his readers can judge as well <u>what</u> he did.

Other letters tempted me to revise the article in more fundamental ways, but I finally decided against this. Steve Eng's letter, for example, points out that there's no analysis of Donald Duck's personality. He's right; I tried to work up a few paragraphs that would sum up Donald as Barks handled him, but I wasn't successful. Steve was, and I felt a strong itch to insert that part of his letter in "The Lord of Quackly Hall" and claim his analysis as my own. But no. In this case, as in others, the article as it stands isn't obviously wrong in any important way; it simply doesn't cover all the ground. There'll be time enough later for other people to write articles about Donald,

and the Junior Woodchucks, and the whole UNCLE SCROOGE series, and all the other things I only touched on, or didn't mention at all. As a road map, "The Lord of Quackly Hall" seems to have served well enough. The revised version for COMIC ART is better, though, and that's the version I'd prefer that you dig out if you ever feel the urge to read "The Lord of Quackly Hall" again.

This dry run worked pretty well, then, but I have no intention of trying another one. In retrospect, the whole idea seems just too damned precious. Writing and revising and rewriting an article...publishing it in FUNNYWORLD so that we cognoscenti can pass judgement before it's offered to the masses ...picking it to pieces again... The hell with it. It was worth it this time, I think, because the article was important enough (to me, and to a few other people) that I wanted it done right. But for almost anything else, no. Fan magazine articles are worth doing well, definitely, but they're not worth fretting and fussing over for months on end. Material from FUNNYWORLD may turn up in general-circulation fan magazines in the future, but it won't be because I planned it that way from the beginning.

Any number of people expressed either disappointment that the article wasn't illustrated or hope that it would be when it appeared in COMIC ART. Unfortunately, as things stand, the article will not be illustrated with any examples of Barks' work. Walt Disney Productions has refused permission to reproduce any of their copyrighted material. I believe that a limited number of illustrations could be used without running any risk--especially if notice of Disney's copyright was included--but Don and Maggie Thompson are reluctant to do this, and COMIC ART is their magazine. The Thompsons have also asked me to cut down the number of direct quotations from Barks' stories, again with the copyright laws in mind. This I've done, with no regret, since some of the story summaries needed trimming anyway.

There were also suggestions that I give fuller data about the stories I discuss (issue numbers, etc.) and that I list the better stories from Barks' later years (which I dismiss too quickly and condescendingly, for all that repeated readings have convinced me that they're inferior to the earlier stories). I won't do this, since "The Lord of Quackly Hall" is not aimed primarily at collectors of Barks stories. It's aimed rather at the "general reader," or, in this case, "the general comics fan." To clutter up the article with issue numbers and footnotes and such would slow down the reader without supplying the collector with any more information than he will be able to get from the Barks index.

And now on to the letters.

From ROGER ARMSTRONG: My recollections of Carl Barks go back to the days when I was barely out of my teens and landed my first honest-to-god comic strip (book) job with what was then the Whitman Publishing Co. In those days there was ritual in the Beverly Hills office...to which we all wended our ways with our assorted bundles of "Porky Pigs," "Sniffles and Mary Janes," etc., etc. ...a ritual which I am convinced was nothing less than a refinement of the worst excesses of Torquemada at the height of the Spanish Inquisition. This ritual was called "The Showing"...a harmless enough title on the face of it, but fraught with such agonies for the victim that my mind boggles at the mere recollection of it. The ritual consisted of the hapless

cartoonist being taken to the inner office, the sanctum sanctorum of the editor, a lady named Eleanor Packer. All the other people who were in the outer offices: secretaries clerks, flunkies of all sorts and most horrible of all, any fellow cartoonists who happened to be in the office, bringing in their stuff, were all summoned and grouped about a large Board of Directors-type table. Then the art editor, a fellow with waspish tongue and a helluva fine cartoonist, named Carl Buettner, since deceased, God rest his soul, would read...READ OUT LOUD, mind you...the material spread out there on the table ...that miserable extension of yourself that you had labored over for weeks ...and all and sundry were invited to comment, look for mistakes, offensive dialogue, errors in punctuation, unclear drawings, anything, in short, that would confuse a five-year-old child. I will say ONE thing for the device: after a short apprenticeship at that outfit, there wasn't any comic book outfit, syndicate,etc., one could go to work where you wouldn't be the shining light of draughtsmanship, and one ended up an expert on the(written) English language. I honestly owe the great strides my drawing took in those days to "The Showing." But it was no fun while it was going on! #/ All this preamble to get to Carl Barks. Any of us fortunate enough to be on tap in the office on those days when Carl and his wife made the trip in from faroff Hemet (where he had a chicken farm), bringing in the latest episode of the saga of the Ducks, we would get in on "The Showing." Needless to say, for Carl, it was nothing but cheers all the way through. He would stand, a painfully shy figure, in the background while the ritual proceeded; I'm convinced he turned his hearing aid off. #/ Carl (Buettner) would read and the only reactions I EVER heard were those of complete admiration. I'm quite sure that Barks received the same amount...(possibly a very small amount more, but not much) that the rest of us guys received in those days. The going rate in the early forties was $10 a page, inked and ready to go, including the indignity of "The Showing." If Carl got as much as $15, I would be very much surprised. Buettner and I used to discuss Carl...he was, even then, the cartoon genius of the group...and we concurred on the fact that Barks was strictly a "Duck" man. Given any other character, he wouldn't have come through on such a tremendously high level. Even an attempt on his part to develop other characters would not have met with the same success that his work with the Ducks did. He had a peculiar affinity with those damn Ducks and he really MADE them as far as comic books go. Many of us in the business have always been aware of the genius quality of his work, but it's great pleasure to hear from someone in faroff Little Rock who knows it too. Not only who knows it but who WRITES about it too!

From RICHARD KYLE: I liked your Barks article very much. It's a fine job. #/ (On the other hand, there may be something missing that I have missed. I think I'm too old to have fully appreciated the funny animals in general and the work of Barks in particular--even though I hold his strips in great esteem. I was born in 1929, and so when I was nine years old the very first costume heroes were just coming on the scene and the really good funny-animal stories were still on the far horizon--except the great "Mickey Mouse," of course. And when the first issue of UNCLE SCROOGE appeared, I was either panting up a Korean hill or "occupying" northern Honshu in Japan. I was born at just the right time to a enjoy the costume heroes to the maximum, and you were born at just the right time to appreciate the best of the funny-animal strips. To really dig 'em, we both had to be young: we both had to be in the age group they were directed toward.) #/ All in all, your analysis of the Barks stories strikes me as very sound. I'm pleased that you see his characters as characters, and not as simple social symbols. But at the same time, I'm less impressed by your comments on Barks as a parodist and satirist

than by your general conclusions. Al Capp's work is marred by a frequent peevishness (which usually stems from a fundamental lack of understanding of the problem at hand)--but I'm less certain that Barks' is. In his stories, Barks usually impresses me as an uncommonly philosophical man, fully aware of our human weakness and failings and ironically amused by them: a man who finds humor in the differences between the idealized theories of human behavior and their actual practice. His parody seems a tartly, but gently, "tolerantly-intolerant" sort, at its strongest--but very, very seldom does it seem "peevish" to me. It is his satire that appears peevish. It seems a consequence of some sudden and painful personal involvement in actual human behavior. The disengaged philosopher appears to have been forcibly engaged, and though the foibles of mankind amuse him at a distance, in a hand-to-hand struggle they enrage him. As Bertrand Russell proves so eloquently and frequently, there are few virtues to be found in the works of an enraged philospher. Happily, Barks is seldom publicly enraged. ## (I wonder, too: for 25 years, Barks had an opportunity to influence the hearts and minds of millions of children. The implicit social content of Barks' stories cannot be discounted, especially since no one else was doing comparable work that reflected other views. I really wonder what effect he has had on youthful--and now adult--opinion?) ## Anyway, a really fine piece, one of the very best comics articles that I've read.

From BILL SPICER: First, I thought "The Lord of Quackly Hall" was an excellently done piece. As the first major essay on Barks (and I know of no other writings on him), you've covered almost all of the important aspects of his work and brought them out into the open. I'm sure that even a lot of the old-time Barks fans will learn something new from reading it. I know I did. The child-parent relationship of Donald and his nephews, particularly, is defined in a way--and to a degree--that shows the series in great depth; I doubt if this would've occurred to too many writers. And the different character analyses. I don't know who might be writing the "Baedekers" you mention in your editorial, but I think they'll be a long time in coming. I have a feeling that you'll be the one to wind up writing them. ## Anyway, "Lord of Quackly Hall" is certainly a big step in that direction. ## I do think you're shortchanging Barks, a little, in the section dealing with his "realistic" art and his cartoon art. You've mentioned that his drawing, in both areas, was quite precisioned and detailed (with the right details), but one finishes the section with the feeling that you're putting down his realistic backgrounds in favor of building up his ability as a straight cartoonist. His cartooning can't and shouldn't be minimized, of course, but on the other hand neither should his realistic settings be glossed over as secondary features. Don't forget--one of the things that lends a certain magic to Barks' best Donald adventures, both the 10-pagers and the novel-length stories, is his uniquely successful combination of convincingly realistic backgrounds and cartoon figures. His draughtsmanship shown in the seascapes, landscapes, deserts, prairies, forests and jungles, was really quite remarkable for a funny-animal series. (For a "realistic" series, as well, I think). And yet, as realistic as they were, they never seemed out of place when peopled with his cartoon figures. The only comics artist who comes to mind who was able to combine the cartoony with the realistic--and who did it as well as Barks, though in a different way--was Will Eisner. Beyond these two, I can't think of any comics artists, of equal drawing talent, who had the ability to combine the "real world" with a cartoony or caricatured world--and have it come out looking wholly integrated as a convincing world of its own. ## I don't quite agree that Barks' combination of the two is "almost grotesque"

as you've pointed out, except possibly in those few strips where he was experimenting with drawing real-looking people, with human facial features and limbs. But the realism of his background settings is a different matter, I think. I'm not suggesting that you should reverse yourself and say, for examole, that Barks' realistic horses were necessarily more suitable to the strips than his cartoony horses were; but his straight illustration in these instances was probably more successful than anyone's ever done in combination with cartooning. I think this bears mentioning. /// In the same section, too, I believe your case would be strengthened by pointing out some of the specific details that made Barks' work so effective. One excellent example that comes to mind immediately is his inclusion of puffins, those strange-looking little birds, in "The Golden Helmet." No other funny-animal cartoonist in his field would've had the forethought or inspiration to add this bit of authentic background detail. As obscure as puffins probably are to most people--to kids, particularly--you knew that they belonged to the locale in which that part of the story was taking place, even if you didn't know what they were called. /// Barks' use of perspective, too, could be mentioned. As far as I know, Barks was the only cartoonist in the Dell/GK line--maybe the only one in any funny-animal comics line, as well--who often worked with the "angle shot" to heighten the dramatic effect of certain panels and sequences. This may seem a minor point to bring out, but I've seen countless examples in his stories where a particular scene's effectiveness is increased by use of perspective--the kind that's usually ignored entirely by ordinary funny-animal cartoonists. Foreshortening...the birdseye view...wormseye view.. some figure distortion, too, generally seen only in "realistic" comics. This wouldn't require getting bogged down in a discussion of mechanics (you're wise to avoid that, in an article of this kind), but I do think Barks' use of perspective could be brought out, briefly, as an important point of your section dealing with his art. I've never seen anyone else, in his field, use it as well.

(From a later letter.)

In regards to cartoonists who use realistic backgrounds, I just thought of another one besides Barks and Eisner--Herge, in his TINTIN books. Herge's characters are mostly cartoony--sort of like a refined C. C. Beck--while his backgrounds are almost photographically realistic, particularly with things like automobiles, buildings, machinery, and even animals (except for Snowy). /// I think Daisy deserves at least a brief mention in your Barks article. It's true that Barks has never used her as an important character, consistently, but there're quite a few stories--and really good ones--in which she plays a major part. If you're looking for something specific to hang a connection on, the romance angle might be worth discussion. Some of the earlier stories involved Donald's and Gladstone's rivalry over Daisy. And that great story about the long-forgotten love letters.

From GARY MASON: My thoughts are rather confused; so I hope you will understand that the following is just my random impressions of the article. /// My main criticism would perhaps be this: the article seems to recount faithfully, and closely-to-chronologically, the career of Carl Barks up to about 1952. Then it stops, with you merely dismissing the rest of his career with a page of general damnations, which I don't feel are altogether fair. I particularly disagree with your estimation of the story "Vacation Time;" together with "Lost in the Andes," I consider it to be the most memorable (which is another way of saying "my favourite," I just realized) of all Barks stories. But there was nothing bad about Barks in the '50s and '60s, which is the im-

pression you seem to convey without ever saying so. Certainly, every artist must reach a "peak" somewhere, but this does not mean that everything they do after it is an anticlimax. And even if it did, I feel that the '50s and the '60s deserved more attention than they got. I feel that your statement on page 11, "by the late '50s, the magic had evaporated," probably embodies the reason for your dismissal of the later stages of Barks' career. It was the magic for you that had evaporated, I think, not the magic in general. And I don't see how Uncle Scrooge is a "relatively inflexible character," in comparison to Donald and his nephews. What have Donald and the nephews got that Scrooge hasn't got, except poverty? After all, the characters' fate hangs in the writer's hands, and he can make them do anything, really. Uncle Scrooge's money, as you said, was often little more than a vehicle to lead the Ducks to an exciting and/or humorous situation, but once in that situation, I fail to see that Uncle Scrooge's personality at all restricted the action. // I think the most worthwhile change you can make in the article is to state plainly where any story you're referring to comes from. As a rule, you've stated the title of the comic, and occasionally the date (or at least the year), but I for one would appreciate a proper cross-reference that can come in use for indexing, looking up, and buying. In other words, the number of the comic. When you're referring to a story in WALT DISNEY'S COMICS & STORIES, it is of course possible to calculate the number from the date, but this is unnecessarily cumbersome, and impossible when the comic referred to was part of the Four Color series. I realise that you're planning on publishing a Barks index soon, but having to put one article down to look up another is a damned nuisance, especially when the second one hasn t been published yet. I think a full reference is most desirable.

From STEVE ENG: My subscription to WALT DISNEY'S COMICS & STORIES was for my eighth year, 1948; my friends called Barks "the good artist." One friend was so avid for Barks that I recall I rented "Terror of the River" for 25¢ or so, like a lending library; you never traded Barks, of course. I can recall being pleaded with to trade off various issues--and resisting. Hard-hearted as Scrooge! // Adventure and weird comics were outlawed at my house. This only turned me to violent and scarey prose--which is far more morbid than comic books. My parents drove me from the frying pan to the fire--by the time I was twleve, I looked down on horror and crime comics as not being stimulating enough. Thus the censorship improved me literarily, if not psychologically. Burroughs was better than Superman, Lovecraft better than EC comics, I felt. Anyway, Barks perhaps filled in the adventure-wonder-fear emotion for me, in the one-shots, that I was not getting from action comics. A lot of kids must have been getting similar kicks this way, in ostensibly "funny" comics. When you're seven years old, an armored man who swipes kis is no joke! Thus the one-shots are ever a part of my nostalgia, deliciously so. "Terror of the River" I bought (or had bought for me) off the stands--I recall it was read aloud to me, and startled my elders at the juxtaposition of kiddie-type ducks and a serpent worthy of at least "B" movies. // I agree with your Barks estimates in part because I was at about the same age as you--and it was probably the best age. Five-to-fifteen were the best childhood years for reading Barks; I was those ages during 1945-55, Barks' best years, roughly, by happy coincidence. Never thought of it this way, but Barks was my favorite childhood author--since he stayed longest with me. // As a kid, I was vaguely aware that the nephew pretense of Huey, Dewey and Louie, Cicero Pig, and Morty and Monty (or Ferdy) was fake, and just a front for them to hit harder at parents without as much tabu-breaking, or as much eyebrow lifting of our parents. "After all, Don-

ald's just their uncle" you could say to yourself or to parent or teacher, if anyone objected to kids' malice in the stories. // Glad you know that literature appeals on several levels, some unconscious. Professors still mostly don't know this, judging aesthetic response by fixed rules, rather than by understanding of the reader. So I'm glad you noted that we identified with the kids' rising to the occasions in the one-shots. Ever see "Dreams of Glory" in THE NEW YORKER, by Steinberg? Always a kid doing something adultly heroic--as we all fantasized. I always figured I could escape if a crook tied me up, and save my parents, and generally assumed I would be more calm than they, too...didn't we all? Parents never consult kids, in crises, yet kids always know all the answers and for some reason aren't asked--probably because same kid threw a tantrum an hour before. I liked Huey, Dewey and Louie, because they weren't super-kids. I never liked the Hardy Boys, although I read them; they seemed so lucky to have a detective father. Feiffer was jealous of Robin. But Donald's nephews had homework, trouble with fractions, spankings, in between Atlantis and the Andes, which made them the closer to us. // But I miss an analysis of Donald's character, and character changes. He is not an already-understood character, since the Barks Donald is not the same creature that the outer world thinks of when you mention his name. They think of the '30s cartoon duck who quacked and shook his fist, or the newspaper duck of Al Taliaferro. Barks made Donald admirable under the crazy behavioral facade. Donald had guts! (He needed them, being of such bad judgment.) Who else would quarrel with a zombie--the first he had met in his life? The immortal quote in "Ghost of the Grotto:" "Going to battle an armored man with a squirt gun and a mouse! Do you suppose Unca' Donald's in his right mind? "I hope not! His sensible ideas never work!" Donald is great in a crisis, sometimes at least (with a little help from his nephews!). But Barks, we know, believes in the individualism of earlier days. Under the satire of Westerns, or of old California, Donald--and Barks--thirst for glory and danger in romantic settings. Donald is, or was, sympathetic to me, for he too represented kid-frustrations. He could never find an occasion to rise to, at least around town in Duckburg. He failed at jobs because the jobs were beneath him, or so he felt. Donald was crazy enough to have perhaps been a great man in the old West, or as a pirate on the Spanish Main. But in suburban society the courage, and imbalance of the duck were liabilities. Only a kid--or Donald--would think of salvaging stamps off letters in wastebaskets as a living, and dream at the same time about finding the rarest stamp of all, in British Guiana. I always identified with Donald's great imagnation and courage to dream--then had to laugh when Barks' tough-minded realism (as you call it) showed that dreaming of action and facing it are two different things. As in "The Golden Helmet," when Donald concedes Vikings got by with brawn and luck, as much as guts. All the same, in the next issue, Donald is always back dreaming and hoping again...something we all need to keep doing, I feel. Kids know this, adults forget, too often are content with reality--the reality of compromise. Kids know there was an Atlantis, and that even a ghost can be handled or foiled in a Scottish castle. Scrooge's guts were even more in evidence, since mated with better judgment, had built up his three cubic acres. The quote you printed--"I made it by being toucher than the toughies," etc. from "Only a Poor Old Man"--was one of my favorites, and I about know it by heart. // My general point, quite an obvious one , is that the ducks' resiliency and quixotic optimism--especially Donald's, because it was alternately the funniest, and the most tragic--was ever heartening to me as a kid. // Glad your article had a light touch, while still probing into the depths of the complicated kid-responses to the various levels of appeal in the stories. One has to be humorously serious

about Barks, or betray the whole business. Imagine the logical extension of our interest--a sober society of Barksophiles meeting once a year for a banquet in white tie and tails, to listen to tedious speeches--such as the museum society Daisy dragged Donald to at the end of "Big Top Bedlam." It's hard to properly collect and study Barks without becoming crackpots like the many organizations and allegedly serious non-profit groups that Scrooge is always fending off. Even binding my comics is a bit of a shaft to Barks, who intended them to be carried in blue-jean pockets, folded down the middle on the way home from the drugstore on Saturday. The sight of a "serious" collection on a bookshelf would really give him a horselaugh.

From BOB FOSTER: I found the Barks article both interesting and informative. The one thing that bothered me was the overall feeling displayed toward Barks. In your introduction you mention your admiration for Barks. After reading the article, I was left with the impression that the article dealt with his downfall. Maybe this isn't so true, but I'd have liked to have seen him put on more of a pedestal. Less picking at weaknesses and more building of strong points. The strong points far outweigh any weaknesses. Any genius has weaknesses, and I'd rather overlook the weaknesses. The fact that Barks was able to continuously crank out creative comic classics for 20 years is amazing. // In the next-to-last paragraph, in commenting on some recent ('60s) strips, you refer to them as sometimes being "simple-minded." Maybe this is true, but it's not a thing I think should be said about Barks. // A coincidence that you should mention Eisner and Kurtzman along with Barks. I feel these were (are) the three top men in comics. All three were fine artists with tremendous drawing abilities. All three were top-notch story tellers. To pick one above the other two is impossible.

From CARL BARKS: I got quite a kick out of your scholarly article about Barks and his triumphs and fizzles. Never guessed there was so much social significance in the stories I did.

It seems you noticed changes in Barks's attitudes and approaches as new formulas appeared, etc. Gosh! I usually changed locales and formulas to avoid boredom to myself, and I hoped the readers would like the VARIETY of plots and the switching around of roles (characterization) of Don and the other ducks. Also there was the necessity to change formulas at times because of criticism from the office, such as the toning down of conflict between Don and the kids.

Well, your Lord of Quackly Hall was very well written. Had the article appeared in Readers Digest or This Week its syntax and structure would have seemed right at home. Perhaps you should stop fooling around with cartooning and aim for a career in journalism.

After reading Quackly Hall I realize that the number of angles and questions could be endless. No wonder so few articles have appeared about writers and artists of the Golden Age of Comics.

A Barks Bibliography: I

There's been yet another change in my plans for the Carl Barks index. I said last issue that the index would be published in two back-to-back installments in FUNNYWORLD, and then, with additions and corrections, as part of a CARL BARKS HANDBOOK. It quickly became clear, though, that publishing the index this way would gobble up too much of my time and too many pages in FUNNYWORLD. More important, it would defeat the whole purpose of publishing the index here. Whatever merit dry runs for articles have, the value of dry runs for indexes should be obvious. Since accuracy in an index is vital, there's everything to be said for cleaning out all the errors before the index is made generally available. The most efficient way to do that is through a magazine like FW. Publishing the index in two large chunks, though, would worsen the odds that errors would be spotted, simply because finding them in all those pages would be more difficult. Similarly, there are collectors who at any given time might take the trouble to supply one needed piece of information, but would balk at digging through their collections to correct half a dozen errors and fill in half a dozen blanks. Spreading the index over six issues of FW, then, makes it more likely that the errors will be spotted--and even more likely that they'll be corrected. It also provides more time for turning up the odd bits and pieces of Barks' work that are scattered through the Disney comics, and for evaluating the organization of the index. In brief, the more leisurely approach is the better approach. The index will be longer coming out, but it will be more worth waiting for.

The organization of this index will follow in most respects the organization of the two checklists I've already published in FUNNYWORLD. As with the checklists of the LOONEY TUNES and OUR GANG series of comics, I'll deal first with the Dell titles and then with the Gold Keys. The change in labels brought too many other changes for the two groups to fit comfortably into the same sections of an index. Also, I'll cover first all the Disney comics with stories about the ducks, and then I'll turn to comics with other characters.

This is how the index will be published in this and the next five issues:

1. Walt Disney's Comics - 1943-1949
2. Walt Disney's Comics - 1950-1962
3. Donald Duck - 1942-1962
   Uncle Scrooge - 1952-1962
4. Other Dell comic books with the Disney ducks - 1949-1962
   Dell comics with other characters - 1943-1947 (Barney Bear, et al.)
5. Gold Key comic books - 1962-1967 (Walt Disney's Uncle Scrooge, etc.)
6. Giveaway and premium comic books
   Other comic material by Barks - Golden books, etc.
   Non-comic material by Barks - letters to fan magazines, etc.
   Material about Barks - newspapers, magazines, fan magazines, etc.

At this point, I'm making no rash predictions about when these installments will appear.

This index will cover only Barks' published comic book work and directly related items done during his 25 years in the field. There'll be no effort made to cover his work for the CALGARY EYE-OPENER, or with the Disney Studio. And, for obvious reasons, the index will cover only American publications.

Within the index itself, the individual entries will be organized this way: issue number, date, full title of each story (except for the omnipresent "Walt Disney's" or "Walt Disney Presents"), number of pages (but not page numbers, unless the comic book has them), and a brief description of each story (except perhaps the one-page gags; I haven't decided yet). The descriptions are not intended as plot summaries; they'll serve only to identify each story. I'll also list Barks' covers and miscellaneous illustrations.

I hope the Barks collectors among FUNNYWORLD's readers will scrutinize the index carefully as each installment appears, and suggest corrections and improvements. It's quite likely, for example, that rewording will improve many of the story descriptions.

Beyond that, there are specific pieces of information that I need. There are some comic books that I know contain Barks material, but I don't have copies; there are other comic books which may contain Barks material, and I need to know if they do or not. In each case, when a comic book does contain Barks material, I need detailed information--story descriptions and the like--of the sort given this time for issues of WALT DISNEY'S COMICS & STORIES.

These are the comic books I'm talking about: Donald Duck 53, 93, Duck Album 686, Donald Duck Album 995, 1110, 1182, Christmas Parade 10, Vacation Parade (Picnic Party) 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, Donald Duck Beach Party 2, Donald Duck in Disneyland 1, Summer Fun 2, Vacation in Disneyland 1 (Dell), Disney giant one-shots (various titles) 26, 27, 30, 39, Donald and Mickey Firestone Christmas giveaway for 1949, and Our Gang 27 and 29. And, of course, if it turns out that there are comics I've overlooked completely I'll want to know about them, too.

I also need information about the last two categories in the list above: non-comic material by Barks and material about Barks. I have some of the fan magazines that contain letters from Barks; I'm sure there are others I don't have. I'm sure, too, that there are other things that might fit into into this category, but I can't think of any.

The last category is probably the most difficult to define. Perhaps it would be simpler to say, first, what I'm not after: (1) passing references to Barks in fan magazines; (2) references to Barks' characters only. If this index were to include every reference to Uncle Scrooge, then it logically would include all the comic book stories using him, whether or not they were by Barks. I'm not about to do that. For the most part, then, what I'm looking for are substantial references to Barks, or articles about him, in fan magazines (e.g., the Disney article in MASQUERADER #6), or articles in magazines and newspapers which refer clearly to stories by Barks (e.g., the CHEMISTRY article that reproduced a half-page from a Barks story). Even defining the limits this closely, putting together a complete list probably will be impossible. There are simply too many nooks and crannies where references to Barks' stories might be tucked away. Not that it matters much; putting together a complete index to Barks' work is more important.

[illegible]

Issue Number and Date	Story title - number of pages - story description
I. COMIC BOOKS WITH THE DISNEY DUCKS	
A. WALT DISNEY'S COMICS & STORIES	
31, April 1943	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald defends his Victory Garden against a gang of voracious crows. (Illustrated by Barks, but not written by him, although he altered the script. This and the other Donald Duck stories in WALT DISNEY'S through No. 41, February 1944, were drawn as six-panel pages--that is, the standard page was only three panels deep.)
32, May 1943	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald insists that the nephews' lucky rabbits foot is a phony, but they have good luck and he has bad. (The first Donald Duck story both written and illustrated by Barks.)
33, June 1943	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald, a lifeguard, tries to impress a pretty girl and "saves" her from a dead shark.
34, July 1943	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald devotes a day to good deeds, but they all backfire. (First appearance of Mr. Jones, Donald's neighbor.)
35, August 1943	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald and the nephews visit a dude ranch and get lost in the desert.
36, September 1943	DONALD DUCK in The Mighty Trapper - 10 - Donald brags about his trapping skills but the nephews fool him with a fox fur.
38, October 1943	DONALD DUCK in Good Neighbors - 10 - Donald and Jones try to bury the hatchet, but without success.
39, December 1943	DONALD DUCK in Salesman Donald - 10 - Donald sells the egg beaters the nephews can't sell, but almost meets his match in a hairy hermit.
40, January 1944	DONALD DUCK in Snow Fun - 10 - Donald takes the nephews skiing and rigs a catapult for a spectacular jump.
41, February 1944	DONALD DUCK The Duck in the Iron Pants - 10 - Donald attacks the nephews' snow fort dressed in a homemade suit of armor.
42, March 1944	DONALD DUCK in Kite Weather - 7 - Donald enters a kite contest dressed as a little boy, but wins dressed as a little girl. (This and all succeeding stories were drawn as eight-panel pages--that is, the standard page was four panels deep.)

Issue Number and Date	Story title - number of pages - story description
43, April 1944	DONALD DUCK Now Showing - Three Dirty Little Ducks - 10 - The nephews vow never to take a bath and try to outwit Donald's efforts to get them in a tub.
44, May 1944	DONALD DUCK This Month - The Mad Chemist - 10 - Donald becomes a scientific genius after suffering a crack on the head, and invents "ducknite," an incredibly powerful explosive.
45, June 1944	DONALD DUCK This Month's Thriller - Rival Boatmen - 10 - Donald cheats the nephews out of a customer for their fishing boat, but soon both he and the passenger need the nephews' help.
46, July 1944	DONALD DUCK in Camera Crazy - 10 - Donald and the nephews compete at taking pictures to sell to the newspaper, and the nephews' little box camera consistently beats Donald's fancier model.
47, August 1944	DONALD DUCK - 10 - A relative sends Donald a falcon, which wreaks havoc on the neighbors' livestock and a model airplane.
48, September 1944	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald and Mr. Jones quarrel over a can of putty and both wind up covered with the stuff.
49, October 1944	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald becomes a tight-wire walker after the nephews become successful at it, and he immediately sets out for Niagara Falls. (First mention of Duckburg, on a sign in the last panel of the last page.)
50, November 1944	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald accidentally gives the kids a rare dime worth $500 and has a hard time getting it back.
51, December 1944	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald buys a "modern seaside home" that proves to be a shack afflicted with everything from sandstorms to giant turtles.
52, January 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - A trade rat invades Donald's home and takes his valuables.
53, February 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald buys a tramp steamer and starts for Acapulco with a cargo of bug bubble bath soap.
54, March 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald and the nephews ice-skate the three miles to Pumpkinburg in a no-holds-barred race.
55, April 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald takes the nephews to cousin Cuthbert Coot's ranch to prove that he knows "cowpunchin' from A to Z."
56, May 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald raids the refrigerator while walking in his sleep and then blames the nephews.

Issue Number and Date	Story title - number of pages - story description
	walking in his sleep and then blames the nephews.
57, June 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald and the nephews compete for a thousand dollars offered for a photograph of the iron-billed woodpecker.
58, July 1945	DONALD DUCK - 8 - The nephews fall off a cliff at the Grand Canyon and Donald "rescues" them.
59, August 1945	DONALD DUCK - 8 - Donald, vacationing at a dude ranch, tries to tame a wild "knothead" colt with kindness.
60, September 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald invents a radar set so that he can track down the nephews wherever they are.
61, October 1945	DONALD DUCK - 8 - The nephews set up a detective agency and trap a bank robber despite Donald's efforts to confuse them with phony clues.
62, November 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald enters water ski races and has to operate his tow boat by remote control when the nephews eat themselves sick on popcorn and candy.
63, December 1945	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald advertises to find the rightful owner of a 10 bill the nephews have found, and is besieged by phony claimants.
64, January 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald resolves not to lose his temper and the nephews run wild, finally digging into Donald's old love letters.
65, February 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews obtain a parrot at the docks--"a guy named Joe from Singapore"--and then try to persuade Donald to let them keep it.
66, March 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald goes ice-fishing, but spends more time under the ice than on it as he battles a big, wily old fish.
67, April 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews buy miniature jet engines with their savings, against Donald's wishes, but the engines save Donald's life when he is trapped on a peak.
68, May 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald builds a huge kite to prove he is the greatest kite maker after the nephews' kite flying disrupts his gardening.
69, June 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Daisy goes wild over Deltoid Biceppa, Susy Swan's muscular boyfriend, so Donald lifts weights to build himself up.
70, July 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews bring home a bright mongrel puppy, but Donald will have only a Smugsnorkle Squatty,

Issue Number and Date	Story title - number of pages - story description
	the world's smartest dog.
71, August 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - On the advice of a young tough named Butch, the nephews play dirty to beat Donald in a swimming race.
72, September 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews play hooky on the first day of school and catch a freight train for Pickleburg--with Donald hot on their trail.
73, October 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - One of the nephews invents a "gold-finder" that "finds" the gold in two of Donald's watches, smashing them in the process.
74, November 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald becomes a bill collector, with the nephews as his assistants and is assigned to collect from a gangster, a wild woman--and himself.
75, December 1946	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews win a Thanksgiving turkey in a raffle, but refuse to let Donald kill him, so Donald enters a crooked turkey shoot. (This is the only story which Barks ever signed--or, at least, in which his name appears. On the fourth page, in the second panel, a can is labeled "Barks' Dog Soup.")
76, January 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald befriends a stray cat that keeps the ducks awake all the night before they are to get up early and go fishing.
77, February 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews wear bug costumes to make Donald believe his home-brewed bug spray makes things grow to giant size.
78, March 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald buys a safe to protect his valuables during a wave of burglaries, and to protect a jar of jam from the nephews. (On the cover of this issue is a box labeled "Barks' Jiffy Chicken Dinner"--a double joke, since Barks had a chicken farm at Hemet, California, in the Forties. The cover was drawn by Carl Buettner, who was for a time art editor at Western Printing's Los Angeles office.)
79, April 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald refuses to take the nephews with him on a picnic with Daisy, so they sabotage the food and the picnic site.
80, May 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald expels the nephews from his back yard so he can plant a prize-winning flower garden, but the nephews insist on playing in the yard anyway.
81, June 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald mistakes a play map of a lost gold mine, drawn by the nephews, for the real thing, and

Issue Number and Date	Story title - number of pages - story description
	heads for New Mexico and the "site" of the mine.
82, July 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald puts together a magic act after the nephews flabbergast him with card tricks, but the nephews sabotage his efforts to impress Daisy.
83, August 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald tries to spend his vacation sleeping, but has to fend off obnoxious door-to-door salesmen.
84, September 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald, who dances only "hepcat," crams on Strauss waltzing so that he and Diasy can win a waltz contest.
85, October 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald buys instruments and tries to transform the nephews into a string trio.
86, November 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald becomes a volunteer fireman, but is quickly demoted from hoseman to squirt man to wet-sack man.
87, December 1947	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald, irate over the high price of turkey, goes hunting in pilgrim costume with a flintlock loaded with dried peas.
88, January 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald must go swimming in Frozenbear Lake on Christmas Day or lose his house on a bet to Gladstone Gander. (First appearance of Gladstone.)
90, March 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald and the nephews are rival telegram messengers, and Donald sends the nephews out with a phony telegram so that he can get the good jobs and big tips.
89, February 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald takes a job as a nightwatchman, guarding $1 million in silk, but the nephews have to prevent him from falling asleep on the job.
91, April 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald stages a high-society garden party with a jungle motif, including nephews who have been hypnotized into thinking they're monkeys.
92, May 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Professor Pulpheart Clabberhead, a child psychologist, talks Donald into letting the nephews do whatever they want.
93, June 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald is the pilot of a round-trip rocketship to the moon, competing against Baron de Sleezy for a $100,000 prize.
94, July 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald becomes a member of the Coast Patrol, on guard against crafty jewel smugglers--who outwit Donald but not the nephews.

Issue Number and Date	Story title - number of pages - story description
95, August 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald and Gladstone brag about their wealth until Daisy asks them to donate $5 each to her club.
96, September 1948	Front cover. DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald forces the nephews to be his caddies, and they trick him into believing he can hit a hole-in-one with every shot.
97, October 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald goes searching for pearls to make Daisy a necklace for her birthday, but finds ball bearings in a giant clam instead.
98, November 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald rides to the hounds on Lord Tweeksdale estate to prove that the members of the duck family are great sportsmen.
99, December 1948	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald stuffs his head full of obscure facts so he can win a barrel of money on a radio quiz how, but he must compete with the nephews for prizes.
100, January 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews are captured by a tricky truant officer who they later discover is Donald in disguise.
101, February 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald is plagued by terrible nightmares and crochets doilies on doctor's orders to relax his thinking nerve.
102, March 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald guards Pizen Spring Dude Ranch during a horse-stealing scare, and buys the same horses over and over again from the wily thief.
103, April 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald and Gladstone, rival beachcombers, split up the beach to look for a valuable ruby lost by the maharajah of Backdore.
104, May 1949	Front cover. DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald raises Uncle Scrooge's sunken yacht by stuffing it with ping-pong balls.
105, June 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald goes to Thrushwhistle Glen to practice echoes and the nephews are there to supply the echoes--for ten cents each.
106, July 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews return from summer camp with a collection of pets who rout both Donald and the black mask burglar.
107, August 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald accidentally drinks "liquid isotopes" that give him the incredible strength of Super Snooper, a comic book hero.

Issue Number and Date	Story title - number of pages - story description
108, September 1949	Front cover. DONALD DUCK - 10 - Instead of eating an enormous frog named B-36 as he had originally planned, Donald enters him in a jumping contest.
109, October 1949	Front cover. DONALD DUCK - 10 - The nephews buy a water divining stick from an old peddler and try to convince Donald that it really works.
110, November 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Donald comes to fetch his nephews home from Camp Waha-Go-Gagaand tangles with three porridge-hungry bears after he arrives.
111, December 1949	DONALD DUCK - 10 - Daisy breaks up with Donald and returns a bundle of steamy love letters, which the nephews later take to Gladstone's house in a box of borrowed books.

Accidentally omitted: the front cover of the August 1948 issue.

The entries for the February and March 1948 issues were accidentally transposed, but the information given for each date is correct.

(To Be Continued.)

- - - Rita Lee came back with a frozen Milky Way and some confession magazines and comic books. She read about a miser duck called Uncle Scrooge, and his young duck nephews, whose adventures took place in a city where all the bystanders, the figures on the street, were anthropoid dogs walking erect. Norwood read about Superman and the double-breasted-suited Metropolis underworld. It was kryptonite story and not a bad one. He went through the book in no time at all and rolled it up and stuck it in his hip pocket. "Did you ever see that dude on television?" he said.

Rita Lee looked up with annoyance from her duck book. "Who?"

"Superman." "Yeah and I know what you're going to say, he killed himself, the one that played Superman."

"It looks all right when you're reading it. I didn't believe none of it on television."

"You're not supposed to really believe it."

"You're supposed to believe it a little bit. I didn't believe none of it."

---from NORWOOD by Charles Portis, Simon and Schuster, 1966.

Q&A

The numbers in parentheses before each question and each answer identify the question and the issue in which it first appeared. Question 7-36, for example, is the 36th question asked since this series began; it was was first asked in this, the seventh issue of FUNNYWORLD.

Questions are invited, particularly on the Dell "funny-animal" comic books of the '40s and early '50s; it's in this area that I'm most nearly expert. Questions about any comic books, animated cartoons and comic strips are welcome, though. What I can't answer one of my readers likely can.

Questions

(4-20) Did any of the Leon Schlesinger/Warner Bros. Cartoons characters make any comic-book appearances before the publication of LOONEY TUNES #1 in 1941?

(5-23) Was there ever an Andy Panda newspaper comic strip? If so, when did it start, how long did it last, and who drew it?

(5-24) Who was the artist who illustrated most of the Raggedy Ann stories in the '40s, as well as the earliest Andy Panda stories in NEW FUNNIES and the whole of TINY FOLKS FUNNIES (Four Color Comic #60)? Was this Henry Vallely?

(5-26) Did Barney Bear and Benny Burro ever appear together in any animated cartoons, or did they operate as a team only in comic books?

(5-27) I'd like to know if any of the following characters appeared in animated cartoons, or were strictly comic book/strip characters: Mooseface McElk, Mary Jane (of Mary Jane and Sniffles), Grandma Duck.

(5-28) The two young woodpeckers, Knothead and Splinter, did appear in the Woody Woodpecker cartoons, of course--but was this before or after their comic book debut in the April 1952 NEW FUNNIES?

(7-36) In FUNNYWORLD #5, I devoted almost two pages to a discussion of the Italian publication "Guida a Topolino" (Tribute to Mickey Mouse), pointing out a number of errors in the listings of the artists of the Disney newspaper strips and comic books. Alfredo Castelli, publisher of

the "Guida," wrote me this summer, saying that the magazine would be reprinted with the errors corrected. There is still a lot of information that he needs, however, and I could supply only a small part of it. I'm listing all of his questions here, in the hope that the readers of FUNNYWORLD can answer at least some of them. He needs this data:

Date of the beginning and discontinuing of the following newspaper strips:

SILLY SYMPHONIES
TRUE LIFE ADVENTURES (Is it still published? Who has drawn it since Jesse Marsh's death?)
JOSE CARIOCA
BUCKY BUG
MERRY MENAGERIE
WALT DISNEY'S CHRISTMAS TALES
SNOW WHITE AND THE SEVEN DWARFS

Date of beginning of:

DONALD DUCK
WALT DISNEY'S TREASURY OF CLASSIC TALES
UNCLE REMUS
SCAMP

Artists of:

SILLY SYMPHONIES
JOSE CARIOCA
BUCKY BUG
WALT DISNEY'S CHRISTMAS TALES

Title of first:

SILLY SYMPHONIES
WALT DISNEY'S TREASURY OF CLASSIC TALES

Was Jose Carioca published weekly, daily, or both? Did Snow White, Little Hiawatha, the Three Little Pigs and Pluto appear in series of their own? Were there other Disney syndicated series, in addition to those mentioned above?

Alfredo also needs the titles of the Disney theatrical films released since 1958, and information about the Disney television programs.

(7-37) From JOHN FAWCETT: Were there any Disney Pop-up books (Blue Ribbon Books) in addition to THE POP-UP MICKEY MOUSE, THE POP-UP MINNIE MOUSE and THE POP-UP MICKEY MOUSE IN YE OLDEN DAYS (a midget pop-up book)? All these were published in 1933 or 1934.

(7-38) From JOHN FAWCETT: How many issues were there of LEE'S GHOST RIDER comic book?

(7-39) From JOHN FAWCETT: Were there any Sears giveaway editions of WALT DISNEY'S COMICS in addition to the 32-page issue published for Christmas 1943?

(7-40) Win Smith has been mentioned in these pages before; in FW #5, he was identified as the cartoonist who inked the very early Mickey Mouse comic strips that Walt Disney wrote and Ub Iwerks penciled. I mentioned at that time that Smith had two stories in LOONEY TUNES #1, and I've since come across two other stories by him in early Dell comic books: a four-page story called "The O'Malley Kids" in THE FUNNIES #43 (May 1941) and another four-pager, "Penguin Pete and His Pal Pudgie," in POPULAR COMICS #48, February 1940. (The Penguin Pete in POPULAR COMICS, incidentally, is the same character who appeared in the "Pat, Patsy and Pete" stories in the 1941-1943 issues of LOONEY TUNES.) I'd like to know more about Win Smith, his comic book work, and his career in general--can anyone fill in any details?

(7-41) A cartoonist named Charles Thorson has done a couple of children's books (for Follet) about an Indian boy; he's identified in one of these books as the man who created Bugs Bunny. I've heard other people credited with creating Bugs, among them a storyman named Ben Hardaway and Tex Avery, once a director for Warner and MGM. Does anyone know anything about Thorson, and the basis of his claim?

(7-42) The old Leon Schlesinger/Warner cartoons are identified variously as "Looney Tunes" or "Merrie Melodies"--what is the basis of this distinction? Were there actually two distinct series of cartoons, and if so, what were the differences between them? (For that matter, I'd like to know almost anything about the history of the Schlesinger Warner organization. Information about most major studios is in astonishingly short supply.)

(7-43) TIME magazine for April 15, 1966, in an article about Walt Disney: "He has just signed a deal with the prestigious Scholastic Magazines Inc., which will take over tie-in publication of Disney stories from now on." I haven't been checking too closely, but there seems to be no indication that anyone except Western Printing is now handling the Disney publications. Was this an error, or has the arrangement not yet taken effect, or what? Can anyone shed any light on this?

(7-44) Dick Moores was identified in a price list I saw recently as a cartoonist who did a number of Mickey Mouse comic book stories over the years--"The House of Fan" Mysteries" in 1946, for example, and "The Old Sea Dog" in 1952. Can anyone confirm this? (I know definitely that Moores once illustrated Disney's "Uncle Remus" Sunday page.)

(7-45) This question concerns the GENE AUTRY comic book. As nearly as I can determine, its publishing history has run this way: There was first a Fawcett series of (I think) 10 issues). Dell continued the Fawcett numbering for a few issues, then began publishing GENE AUTRY in the Four Color series. Regular publication began with #1 in 1946. What I need to know is this: how many issues Dell published that continued the Fawcett numbering, and what dates these issues had. (For that matter, I'd also like some information about the dates, etc., of the Fawcett series.)

(7-46) This question concerns the series of adaptations of Luke Short novels that Dell published in the mid-'50s. Andy Zerbe tells me that there were two issues of LUKE SHORT'S MYSTERY STORIES, dated April-June and October-December 1954. Can anyone tell me if these were published by Dell, and if so, whether there were any other issues before Dell began publishing short adaptations in the Four Color series in 1955?

Answers

(3-1) THE EARLY WALTER LANTZ COMIC STRIPS

From DICK MARTIN: ""Oswald the Rabbit" was a regular feature in an old tabloid-sized magazine, NEW FUN,aas follows:

NEW FUN #1, Feb. 1935:	Unsigned, but captioned "By arrangement with Univeral Pictures"	
" " #2, Mar. " :	" " " " " " " "	
" " #3, Apr. " :	" " " " " " " "	
" " #4, May " :	Signed "Lindy" (John Lindemayer?)	
" " #5 , Aug. " :	" "John" (" ")	
" " #6, Oct. " :	" "Al Stahl"	
MORE FUN#7, Jan. 1936:	" " "	(discontinued after this issue)

I know of no other Lantz-character features in comic magazines of those early years. However, as you probably know, in 1934 Whitman issued a number of Big Little Books based on animated cartoons. Among these were BETTY BOOP, SCRAPPY, and OSWALD THE LUCKY RABBIT. The title page of the latter credits "Universal Pictures presents Carl Laemmle's..." Final word on the Oswald pages: they involve very simple gag situations, several merely in pantomime, and in my opinion, rather poorly done.

(Does anyone out there know anything about Carl Laemmle, and how Oswald came to be identified as his character? In fact, does anyone know anything about the early history of the Lantz cartoons? At what point did Oswald actually become a "Lantz character?" The following questions also remain about the early Lantz comic books: (1) did any Lantz characters appear in comic books between MORE FUN #7 in 1936 and CRACKAJACK FUNNIES #39 in 1941 (the first Andy Panda story)? (2) In what issue of THE FUNNIES did Oswald and Li'l Eight Ball first appear--#64?)

(3-5) THE BUGS BUNNY CARTOONIST IN THE MIDDLE FORTIES

From ROGER ARMSTRONG: The cartoonist who drew the Bugs Bunnys during the middle and late Forties, as well as the two special one-shots you mentioned, is Tom McKimson. Tom is now a senior editor for Western Publishing Co., and does all the coloring books and special material of that sort. He doesn't draw at all any more except to indicate what he wants for one of the artists.

(For those with long memories, it was Tom McKimson's work I was praising in a Mailing Comment to Fred Patten on page 14 of FUNNYWORLD #3, published last December.)

(3-6) THE MARY JANE AND SNIFFLES AND PETER WHEAT CARTOONIST

From RALPH HEIDAHL: Al Hubbard.

(Gary Mason has said he thinks Al Hubbard is still doing work for the Disney comics published overseas; does anyone know if this is the case?)

(3-7) THE BUGS BUNNY CARTOONIST IN THE LATE FIFTIES

From RALPH HEIDAHL: Tony Strobl, mostly, and some by Phil Delara.

(3-8) THE BUGS BUNNY CARTOONIST IN THE EARLY FIFTIES

From RALPH HEIDAHL: Tony Strobl.

(3-9) THE END OF THE OUR GANG SERIES OF MOVIE SHORTS

According to FILM FAN MONTHLY, the series ended in 1944, a full five years before the Our Gang stories were dropped from OUR GANG COMICS. This means that the characters continued to "grow up" in the stories by Walt Kelly even after they were no longer "growing up" on film. Does anyone know if this was Kelly's idea, or if he "aged" the characters according to editorial dictates? Especially notable is the transformation of the Negro boy, Buckwheat. At first a stereotyped comic character (as he must have been in the shorts), he evolved in Kelly's hands into a mature, intelligent adolescent whose race was irrelevant to everyone else in the stories, good guys and bad guys alike. Bucky was, I suppose, the first believable Negro character in the comics. It's sad to think that it was another 15 years after the Our Gang stories ended before other Negro characters of this sort started turning up in comic books.

(3-12) RED RYDER COMICS AND HI-SPOT COMICS

From DICK HOFFMAN: I have HI-SPOT COMICS #2, November 1940, published by Hawley, and this does not contain any Red Ryder strips at all, as Bill Thailing thought it did. It does contain "The Sea Wolf" and the "David Innes" strips as stated, and also has three pages of Alley Oop, along with a couple of other strips, but no Red Ryder.

From RICK DURELL: HI-SPOT #1 was reprints of the first Red Ryder strips, and even had the origin of Little Beaver. The comic is dated September 1940, and has 1938-39 Red Ryder reprints. HI-SPOT #2, November 1940, had several strips, as Bill Thailing stated, but it did not have any Red Ryder at all.

(That clears up that, hopefully. Now: does anyone know when K.K. Publications began publishing RED RYDER COMICS? Hawley published the comic through at least #6, and according to Thor Johnson, K.K. published RED RYDER #8. Who published #7?)

(3-17) DELL'S WAR STORIES COMIC BOOK

From DICK HOFFMAN: Dell's WAR COMICS #1 was published in 1940, not 1941; it was undated.

(3-19) WALT KELLY'S EARLIEST COMIC BOOK WORK

From DICK MARTIN: The magazine in question was THE COMICS MAGAZINE. Issue #1, May 1936, contained a one-page Walt Kelly comic, "Cannonball Jones." It also appeared in #2. Issues 2 through 5 carried the full title THE COMICS MAGAZINE-FUNNY PAGES, with FUNNY PAGES emphasized on the cover. The last three issues (July through September) contained no Kelly work. The earliest Kelly material I've found are these abortive features in MORE FUN and its companion magazine NEW COMICS, as follows:

NEW COMICS #1, Dec. 1935: "Gulliver's Travels"
" " 2, Jan. 1936: " " " (discontinued after this issue)

MORE FUN #7, Jan. 1936: "Down by the Old Mill Stream"
" " 8, Feb. " : "The Little People"
(No Kelly work in later issues.)

There were no Kelly features other than those I've listed. They all were single-pagers. (The "Gulliver's Travels" was a double-page center spread, panel-style feature.) "The Old Mill Stream" was a single-page panel cartoon. "Little People" and "Cannonball Jones" were strips, the latter occupying only a half page. Most of these features were labeled "to be continued" or "see what happens in the next issue" but all ran for only one or two issues.

From MAGGIE THOMPSON: THE COMICS MAGAZINE was published in May 1936, cost 10¢, and that was Vol. 1, #1. It was published monthly by Comics Magazine Company, Inc. (Chicago) and carried "Back to Nature With Cannonball Jones" by Kelly. In this first issue, the strip covered only about 3/4 of one page--and was all the Kelly in the issue.

(5-25) THE BUGS BUNNY CARTOONIST IN THE LATE FORTIES

Letters from Paul Leiffer and Ralph Heimdahl himself have confirmed that Ralph Heimdahl was indeed the cartoonist about whom I asked. Paul also supplied this additional information: Ralph Heimdahl was a Disney animator for four years; in 1946, he created "Minnie Soo and Little Haha" for CROWN COMICS; in 1947, he did Bucky Bug, Mary Jane and Sniffles and Bugs Bunny stories for Western Printing; in 1949, he took over the Bugs Bunny newspaper strip (which he still illustrates), and has done a variety of other material for Western since then--coloring books, comic book covers, Golden books, etc. However, he has never worked on the Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse comic books.

(6-31) THE CHARACTERS FEATURED IN COMIC ALBUM #16

From GARY LASON: The characters featured in COMIC ALBUM #16 are The Flintstones.

(6-33) "THE OWL" IN CRACKAJACK FUNNIES AND POPULAR COMICS

From RICK DURELL: The Owl was in POPULAR COMICS #72, February 1942, through #86, April 1943. He started in #25 or #26 of CRACKAJACK FUNNIES (july or August 1941); the last issue I have with the Owl is CRACKAJACK FUNNIES #43, January 1942.

(CRACKAJACK FUNNIES expired with #43, so the Owl obviously was shifted to POPULAR the following month, missing not even a month's appearance because of CRACKAJACK's demise. The Owl was revived recently, of course, evidently without success.)

THAT QUIZ AGAIN...

Those of you with long memories will recall my "funny animal" quiz in FUNNYWORLD #3, published all of nine months ago. That was a minutiae quiz, you'll recall, with obscure questions drawn from the Dell funny-animal comic books of the '40s and early '50s. I said at the time that I might not even publish the answers, since I put the quiz together to stir my own memory more than anyone else's. Several people said they wanted the answers, though, so here they are. (I've also listed questions, for the benefit of those whose memories are not so long.)

1. The Junior Sub-Teen-Age Debbies Club.
   A: Daisy Duck's social club in WALT DISNEY'S COMICS #84 (1947).
2. On whose doorstep was Henery Hawk left as a foundling egg?
   A: Beaky Buzzard's, in LOONEY TUNES #22 (1943).
3. Hopalong Casserole.
   A: The obnoxious grasshopper in "Public Nuisance No. 1," the lead story in the first Bugs Bunny Four Color comic (1943).
4. The Barrel.
   A: The swarthy foreign villain in several Our Gang adventures.
5. Tubby, in the LITTLE LULU comic books, had one last name in the early stories and a different last name later on; give both last names.
   A: Trimble in the early stories, Tompkins later on.
6. What was the cannibal's name in the Pat, Patsy and Pete strip in LOONEY TUNES?
   A: Hokery Pokery.
7. Colonel Southern.
   A: The Southern colonel in the early Li'l Eight Ball stories in NEW FUNNIES.
8. What is the lowest rank in the Junior Woodchucks?
   A: Major (according to the first Woodchuck story, in WALT DISNEY'S COMICS #125, 1951).
9. Smiling John Romper.
   A: The bulldog captain of the pirate ship in a 1946 issue of OSWALD the Rabbit, illustrated by Walt Kelly.
10. "Prisoner Number 3B90966478O, alias Torpedo Wolf, alias Killer-Diller Wolfie Boy, alias Lobo the Louse, alias Houdini Wolf."
    A: The villain (an escaped convict) in the Happy Hound stories by Carl Barks in OUR GANG #s 10 and 11 (1944).
11. Mr. Omi-Akin-Bak.
    A: The man in the Himalayan country of Shangreet-lo to whom the diamond was sent in the 1946 BB one-shot, BUGS BUNNY'S DANGEROUS VENTURE. He never appeared in the story, although his name was constantly mentioned.
12. Petey Pack Rat and Jackson Rabbit.
    A: Two of the animals who lived in Mary Jane's garden in the Mary Jane and Sniffles stories in 1950s issues of LOONEY TUNES.
13. Shadrack and Honeysuckle.

A: Li'l Eight Ball's rival and sweetheart, respectively.

14. The Gneezles.
A: See page 16 of FUNNYWORLD #6.

15. Where did Bucky Bug live?
A: Junkville.

16. Hi-Yah Wahoo, Toby Bear and Maggie Lou
A: Oswald the Rabbit's friends in the earliest issues of NEW FUNNIES—all were dolls, although Toby Bear survived and metamorphosed into a "real" bear after a time.

17. On top of what hill was Uncle Scrooge's money bin first located?
A: Killmotor Hill (WALT DISNEY'S COMICS #135, 1951).

18. Tommy and Marion.
A: Andy Panda's young human friends in the early AP stories in THE FUNNIES and NEW FUNNIES, when Andy was still a "talking panda" and not a true "funny animal."

19. Who was the founder of Duckburg?
A: Cornelius Coot (WALT DISNEY'S COMICS #138, 1952).

20. "Jackaruni! Cackaruni! Mackaruni!"
A: This was what the giant golden Indian, El Dorado, said when he ordered his warriors to seize Donald Duck and the nephews in DONALD DUCK AND THE GILDED MAN, a 1952 one-shot.

21. Spencer and Drool
A: The two bison boys in FUNNIES in the early '50s.

22. Petrox.
A: Black Pete's alias in a Mickey Mouse serial, "The Ghost of Man-eater Mountain," in 1951 issues of WALT DISNEY'S COMICS.

23. Horace Mustang, Sagebrush Savage, Trigger Trueshot, Ramrod Ransom, Stumpalong Hoppity, Pinfire Remington, and Carson Sage.
A: Western movie stars mentioned by Donald Duck in a 1948 one-shot, DONALD DUCK IN SHERIFF OF BULLET VALLEY.

24. Foola Zoola.
A: The witch doctor who held a grudge against Uncle Scrooge in DONALD DUCK IN VOODOO VOODOO (1948).

25. What was Gladstone Gander so ashamed of that he kept it locked away in a safe?
A: A dime--the only money he ever worked for (WALT DISNEY'S COMICS #140, 1952).

26. What was the name of the whaling ship on which Mickey Mouse sailed?
A: The Lady Daffodil (in the FC serial, "Mighty Whale Hunter," in 1950 and 1951 issues of WALT DISNEY'S COMICS).

27. Camp Waha-Co-Gara
A: The summer camp where Donald Duck's nephews stayed in WALT DISNEY'S COMICS #110 (1949).

28. What was Knothead Woodpecker's original name?
A: Nuthead.

29. Who was king of Itsa Mara and adjoining subdivisions?
A: King Hevvawazza, in DONALD DUCK IN ANCIENT PERSIA, 1950. See page 17 of FUNNYWORLD #6.

30. Colonel Basset.
A: The Southern gentleman who hired Mickey Mouse to rid his house of seven ghosts in a 1949 serial in WALT DISNEY'S COMICS.

In case you haven't noticed, Walt Disney's name is no longer signed to the Disney comic strips.

LETTERS

A MODEST PROPOSAL...

...From JOHN FAUCETT: Let's have a comic book festival. We're as responsible for the high prices comics are bringing today as anyone. Dealers certainly wouldn't ask them if they thought they couldn't get them. At one time or another we've all found bargains in bookstores, flea markets, junk shops, etc., that are not exactly to our collecting interests--how about sharing these with other collectors? What I'd like to propose is that everyone who wants to will take a full page ad in FUNNY WORLD listing all kinds of comics (Golden Age, early Marvels--no junk) and related items at the minimum possible price...the price you paid or even less. Only people who take out ads will be eligible to buy from other collectors' ads, and there ought to be a minimum number of comics that everyone has to put up--say 15 or 20. There should also be a starting date, before which no advertiser will accept an order (or an order postmarked before a certain date). That way everyone would have an equal shot at the items that interest them. I'm willing to put my comics where my mouth is. Who knows, if we can work this out on a continuing basis, we may force the dealers' prices down. I think it should be tried, at least once.

From BILL SPICER: This sort of ties in with your remarks, and Dick Lupoff's remarks, in the letter section of FUNNY WORLD #5, where amateur strips are discussed. I think amateur-produced comic strips, in fandom, should put more emphasis on experimentation than on imitating what the professionals are already doing. I doubt if an amateur could ever do the average pro comic better than the pros are doing it. Some fans try, consistently, but it never comes off. I think there should be more experimental works produced by amateurs, both in and out of fandom. WITZEND is a step in this direction, potentially, but so far it's produced nothing even remotely approaching what I'd consider "experimental." (Maybe it never will. I doubt that Wallace Wood is interested in going much beyond conventional, commercially-copyrightable ideas). But what is considered experimental and non-commercial right now will some day be quite commercial. This is where the amateur can produce something of value. If graphic story ideas can be tried in the form of amateur strips, in their own publications, whatever good ideas there are will eventually work their way out into mainstream publications. Not in conventional comic books, necessarily, but in comics magazines...the "graphic story field," as it may be called. Maybe fan publications could help in forming that field. Then again, maybe not. Unless amateur writers and artists give up thinking of comic strips in terms of pretty pictures in little boxes, with accompanying dialog, it doesn't look too likely. It is no trick at all to get five or six well-drawn pictures on a page, and call it a page of a comic strip. I don't see much point in that--not as a basis for justifying the existence of amateur-produced strips.

(Continued From Page 3.)

the Pooh and the Heffalumps," is directed by Woolie Reitherman, as was the first. Production began in January. More important, perhaps, is that the Disney Studio is returning to the production of short cartoons--not Donald Duck or Goofy shorts, this time, but Ward Kimball shorts. Kimball, one of the best (and best-known) of the Disney animators, gave us "Toot, Whistle Plunk and Boom" and such TV programs as "Mars and Beyond." His work on the Disney features includes the animation of the crows in "Dumbo" and the Pancho sequence in "The Three Caballeros," among many other accomplishments. Hopefully, he now will give us the first good theater shorts since the Warner Bros. cartoon department was shut down. Disney's has re-entered the shorts market because they want to use short cartoons on the TV program, inserting one cartoon in an otherwise all-live-action program...The next Disney feature cartoon, "The Jungle Book," will be playing at Grauman's Chinese in Los Angeles in October, and will be released in the rest of the country in time for the Christmas holidays. The feature to follow (in 1970 or so), "The Aristocats," will concern a family of cats living in Paris at the turn of the century. The film will be based on a book, but not on one that has been published; Walt got to it first. As for the older Disney features, "Peter Pan" will be re-released next summer.

ADDENDA TO FULLYWORLD #5: The standard Disney studio animation crew since Xerox consists always of an animator, assistant animator, breakdown animator and/or inbetweener. The wording on Page 7 of FW #5 could be read as saying that the crew might be reduced to an animator and an inbetweener, which is never the case..."Scrooge McDuck and Money" was released in March, evidently without much fanfare; it was distributed in some parts of the country with the live-action feature "Bullwhip Griffin." Walt Disney reportedly liked Carl Barks' version of Uncle Scrooge, but felt it wouldn't animate well; Ward Kimball and Fred Moviet designed the film version...The Ray Bradbury-Chuck Jones collaboration will involve new material, not one of Bradbury's old stories. A subject hadn't been decided upon, as of a few months ago.

A FEATURE-LENGTH Oz cartoon, "Journey Back to Oz," was announced earlier this year by Filmation, for release in December 1968. Many such animated features fail to materialize, but this one may prove an exception, since it has been on and off production for several years.

HISTORICAL NOTES: I've mentioned above how much animation for recent features Walt Disney scrapped, but this was nothing new. The first of the Disney features, "Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs," was to have included several sequences that eventually were discarded. One sequence was animated in which the Dwarfs made a bed for Snow White, and another sequence was completed in pencil. That sequence, which was shown on the Disney TV show years ago, and again at the Montreal Animation Retrospective, had the Dwarfs extracting the bar of soap Dopey had swallowed, and then eating the meal that Snow White had prepared. A sequence was completed in pencil for "Pinocchio" in which the puppet made his escape for Pleasure Island amid searchlights and machine-gun fire. Walt wanted to use it, but was persuaded that it would be out of tune with the rest of the film. Of course, the prospects for the Disney Studio in those days were so bright that perfectionism was a permissible luxury. "Snow White's" success showed what might have been, but for the war.

VEVE MITO, the fine cartoonist who did such comic book stories as "Henery Hawk," "Huff the Prairie Dog" and "Homer Pigeon" for many years, is now an animator for Hanna-Barbera Productions. He was also in animation (for Schlesinger) before beginning his long comic book career....Also working for Hanna-Barbera is Michael Maltese, who was a storyman for Warner Bros. for many years. Even if you failed to observe the credits of the Warner cartoons closely, you should have heard his name if you were watching the Porky Pig TV show earlier this summer. A ship was identified as the "S.S. Michael Maltese" in one cartoon. Maltese joined the Schlesinger studio in 1939, and thereafter turned out the stories for most of the best Schlesinger/Warner cartoons. He was the co-creator of Yosemite Sam, Sylvester, Pepe le Pew, Charlie Dog, and the Roadrunner and the Coyote. At Hanna-Barbera, he has created some of their better characters, notably Quick Draw McGraw and Snagglepuss... H-B, of course, is producing nothing now but super-hero cartoons, and has the mind-boggling total of 12 series on Saturday morning TV this fall, six new and six returning...As fitting a way as any, I suppose, to observe the 10th anniversary of the founding of the studio. H-B is now owned by the Taft Broadcasting Co., although Bill Hanna and Joe Barbera remain in charge.

THE LEADER OF THE BAND: The men who compose the music for short cartoons are usually overlooked when laurels are awarded (or tomatoes tossed). Yet inadequate scoring can hurt or even ruin an otherwise excellent cartoon. For many cases in point, you need look no farther than the Saturday morning "Roadrunner" program. The instrumentation for many of the cartoons on that show, and for all of the later Warner cartoons, is dreamy, detatched and thinly instrumentated. It pulls the rug out from even the most brilliant Chuck Jones cartoons. The music in the earlier Warner cartoons, by contrast, is wild, slam-bang stuff, vigorously underlining everything that happens on the screen. It's this that a good slapstick cartoon needs, and it's this that Carl Stalling supplied. Many Warner cartoons would have been less funny--or not funny at all--without Stalling's music. Stalling's roots in the business go deep indeed; it was he who scored "Steamboat Willie," the first Mickey Mouse cartoon with sound. The sound effects editing in the old Warner cartoons was equally effective, and the man who deserves the credit for it is Treg Brown. More recently, he won an Academy Award for his work on "The Great Race."

WARNER BROTHERS is returning to cartoon production, five years after shutting down their department. In recent years, the only new cartoons using the Warner characters have been produced by DePatie-Freleng, and pretty dreadful they've been, too. Warner's plans call for producing cartoons fully as good as their old cartoons. They intend to have, eventually, three animation units producing 30 theatrical shorts a year, as well as a TV cartoon department to produce limited-animation cartoons of the usual sort. However, Warner's is producing its theatrical cartoons, too, with TV in mind. TV, beyond question, is where the money is for cartoon producers these days, the more so since the Saturday morning has become so much more competitive and advertising rates are rising. The theaters, by contrast, simply will not pay well for shorts. The public likes them, but the shorts don't attract the public to the theater in the first place.

STAGGERING STATISTICS DEPARTMENT: The Disney Studio has a "morgue" in which are kept all the original pencil animation drawings for every

Disney cartoon since the first Mickey Mouse. The drawings are bundled in paper folders by scene, and these are stacked on shelves. The drawings for a Disney feature occupy, at a minimum, a space six feet high and 12 feet long; the drawings for "Sleeping Beauty" take twice that much space.

"HE'S YOUR DOG, Charlie Brown," the latest of the Peanuts specials, will be shown in February on CBS...Lee Mendelsohn Productions is also producing a "Babar" special, based on the children's books by Jean de Brunhoff.

THE FOOTAGE SYSTEM: In the early '40s, all the studios except Disney's adopted the requirement that every animator and his assistant turn out 25 feet of finished animation every week. That's 25 feet of film, which is 400 frames, or roughly 16 seconds of screen time. (Unlike the Disney Studio, all other animation studios have only two working classifications for animators: the animator and assistant animator. Each animator has one assistant.) Of course, scenes vary--some are quite difficult and some are very easy--so at first there was a good deal of complaining. One animator at the old MGM studio was so irritated by the system that he made it a point never to be caught working. Whenever the management looked in, he would be flying paper airplanes or determining the specific gravity of the room, or doing something equally constructive. The management was furious, but he always turned out his 25 feet. If he had an easy scene and got his work done a day or two early, he would practice bowling down the studio halls. These days, Hanna-Barbera demands 150 feet a week for its TV cartoons--which explains why they're the way they are. DePatie-Freleng, for their theatrical cartoons ("Pink Panther," et al.) demand 40 to 60 feet a week, and the current MGM "Tom and Jerry" cartoons are ground out at 40 feet a week. The average at Disney's is only about five feet a week, and on "Sleeping Beauty" the average was closer to two feet a week. That film took five years and $6.5 million to make, and its effect on the Disney animation program was hardly beneficial.

The Doings at Montreal

(I was unable to attend the Animation Retrospective at Montreal, but a FUNNYWORLD reader filed this report:)

A "World Retrospective of Animation Cinema" was presented at Expo 67 in Montreal, Canada, during August 13 through August 18. It was organized by the Montreal International Film Festival and the Cinematheque Canadienne in collaboration with the National Film Board of Canada, and under the patronage of the International Federation of Film Archives, the International Animated Film Association and the Motion Picture Association of America. It amounted to a screening of 178 animated films, consisting of the very earliest American and foreign pioneer efforts and a sampling of typical American and foreign animated films through the years, right up to 1967. This retrospective, then, was invaluable to students of animated film history, but was not as enjoyable generally as it could have been if it had instead presented the best films from each period. As the name implies, the retrospective included all types of animated films: animated cut-outs, puppets, any number of objects, people (photographed in stop-motion), shapes or lines painted or etched directly on 35mm film without a camera, ink-line

cartoons (the most common), and the animated "art" films achieved by brush-painting directly on cells (or paper or glass) or by using chalk, crayon, or anything else. The films were shown in the handsome Expo Theater, which seats 2,000. The theater was usually about half-filled, but then it was competing with all of Expo 67. Many important people in animation attended the Retrospective, including John Randolph Bray, Dave Fleischer, Paul Terry, Walter Lantz, Otto Messmer, Ub Iwerks, Chuck Jones, Les Goldman, Bob Clampett, Art Babbitt, Bill Tytla, Ward Kimball, Bill Littlejohn, Bill Hurtz, Pete Burness, Steve Bosustow, Shamus Culhane, Norman McLaren, Fred Wolf, Jim Murakami, Carl Bell, and Robert Breer.

The 178 films were divided into these [illegible]:

(1) European pioneer efforts
(2) American pioneer efforts
(3) Later films by American pioneers (including Disney's "Dumbo")
(4) Films by other filmmakers
(5) American studios' films from the 1930s
(6) Films by contemporary filmmakers
(7) Walt Disney cartoons
(8) Tex Avery cartoons
(9) Contemporary and experimental films
(10) Tom & Jerry cartoons and Walter Lantz cartoons
(11) Films from ASIFA animated film festivals
(12) More contemporary films
(13) Warner Bros. cartoons
(14) Cartoons featuring famous American cartoon characters
(15) More films by famous filmmakers
(16) UPA cartoons

As one might expect, no amount of writing could even begin to mean as much as actually seeing these films. However, a few general observations can be made: One is the unexpected quality of a few of the early cartoons. Another is the dullness of so many of the European animated films, by American theatrical standards. Perhaps these European films should be excused in part on the ground that some of their intended humor is not understood on this side of the world. Another observation is the great need for outstanding cartoon story content if future cartoons are ever to enjoy the great popularity of the cartoons of the past--among other things, the old dynamite gags and the smash-somebody-flat-with-a-mallet gags have been worked to death.

- -

Those who found Wally Wood's "Disney orgy" in THE [illegible]IST to their liking should send $1 (and 25¢ postage) to The Print Mint, 830 Folger, Berkeley, Calif. 94710, for a print called "Odalisque," by Joel Beck. An odalisque, according to my dictionary, is a "female slave or concubine in a harem." I believe odalisques were the subjects of some late 19th Century paintings (Manet?); I vaguely recall one painting which depicts a nude odalisque reclining on a couch. In this case, the nude female is Daisy Duck. The Print Mint also sells (at 50¢ each) two "Beck Books," MARCHING MARVIN and [illegible] OF LAREDO. Both are undergraduate impertinences of the WONDER WART-HOG variety (although considerably better-drawn). MARVIN is notable for the most vicious attack on Walt Disney I've ever seen. He's pictured as a child molester.

CAPA-alpha MAILING COMMENTS

To MICHEL FEYON (Good Grief): Welcome to X-a! It will be a real pleasure to hear about the French and Belgian comic books "from the source." I have all of the American and British editions of the Tintin books, and they rank high among my favorites. As you can tell from Fred Patten's HEAVY WATER, we CAPA-alphans already know quite a bit about the French-language comics, but I'm sure there's much more that you can tell us.

To FRED PATTEN (Heavy Water): I'd say that BRAND ECCH is potentially a much better comic book than INTERIOR FIVE because its format is much more flexible and because Lee has much better artists at his disposal than does Bridwell. What he needs to do is stop parodying his own characters, first of all, and then branch out beyond parodies of super-heroes. He could turn out something akin to the old MAD, if only he would. As things stand, he is, as you say, producing something more like slapstick than like parody. It's hard to be really perceptive and cutting when you're taking digs at your own stuff. // Still no word at this time on whether the NC "Phantom Tollbooth" will be done in Feiffer-style art. // Alex Toth evidently did do the Disney ZORRO issues; the earlier, non-Disney issues were done by the same artist who did the SILVERTIP one-shots, among the many Dell comics he illustrated. // WHAM-O GIANT COMICS is not distributed in Little Rock--as the King packages still are not--but Bill Spicer sent me a copy recently. It's odd, to say the least. I found nothing in it to my liking except John Stanley's page and Wally Wood's "Goody Pumpkin," which reminds me of those off-center stories Walt Kelly used to do for comics like EASTER WITH MOTHER GOOSE and CHRISTMAS WITH MOTHER GOOSE. I wish Wood would do more stories like this, and turn out fewer of those super-heroes who seem to have been cast from stainless steel.

To KEN FLETCHER (Ruthalode Morning Mishap): I always get a kick out of the FOOM, although I can never think of anything to say about it. I suppose I like it for the same reason I loved George Metzger's "Master Time and Robius Tripp"--it's the sort of thing I'd never dream of doing myself (and couldn't bring off if I tried). I'd feel as if I were walking down Main Street nude. Thanks for the vicarious thrills.

To JOHN KNAP:(Boomerang): That's a remarkable exchange you had with Bob Schoenfeld. I doubt that anyone can claim copyright on the "Bidgee" logo, since, if memory serves, it was introduced in an uncopyrighted issue of THE COMIC READER. But even if Bob is correct, and the logo is copyright in his name, it would be unconscionable of him not to transfer that copyright to you. You were paid nothing for your work, and you didn't even do it for Bob Schoenfeld. For him to claim the benefit of copyright protection under such circumstances is inexcusable.

To DON AND MAGGIE THOMPSON (Rainy Days): So tell us more about how come Chug Chug Curtis is named after Maggie's father, you furshlugginer namedroppers.

- -

INFLATION STRIKES: Until this summer, all of Western Printing's Gold Key comic books were a fraction of an inch wider than the comics of other publishers. No longer. Now UNCLE SCROOGE and FANTASTIC FOUR occupy just as wide a space on the newsstands.